

A
REVIEW
OF A
CONFERENCE
BETWIXT

Epaphroditus and Epaphras :

K Wherein the very Reverend
Principal HADOW'S SERMON,

Preached before the
SYNOD of FIFE,

April 7th, 1719.
Is fairly ENQUIRED into.



• EDINBURGH:

Printed by John Mosman and Company, for John Paton
Book-seller in the Parliament Close, 1719.

CONFIDENTIAL

BETWEEN



CONFIDENTIAL

5683

ADDITIONAL

CONFIDENTIAL



*To the Anonymous Author of a
Conference betwixt Epaphro-
ditus and Epaphras, wherein
Principal HADOW's Synodical
Sermon is enquired into.*

INTRODUCTION.

S I R,

IF all the Respect be not given you, that
may be due to your Character, you'll
have me excused; seeing you have seen
meet to conceal your Name: And in Imitati-
on of your Modesty, I shall be nameless too.
I shall not enquire into the Reasons of your
chusing the dialogistick Way of writing, nor
of your calling up the venerable Names of

Epaphroditus and *Epaphras* upon the Stage of your Conference : However I must applaud your Wisdom, in making both your *dramatick Persons* to be of one Side of the Question. Opposite Persons might have kindled a Fire of too warm Contention; while the one urged a Reason too hard, the other might be straitned to find out a satisfying Answer. But when both are of one Side, and *alike concerned in the Matter against a common Antagonist*; the one will not too unmannerly press a Difficulty on his friendly Neighbour : Nor will the other be hard put to it in framing an Answer ; and the Answers given will be readily acquiesced in. And so Peace, Friendship, and good Temper shall be preserved betwixt them, which is a most desirable Thing, and a strong Defence against an Adversary, for, *Vis unita fortior*. Wherefore I shall cite the Words of your *Persons* promiscuously, seeing both are employed to express your Mind.

You have placed *Principal Hadow's* Name in the Frontispice of your Pamphlet, that in solemnizing the Victory you have obtained over him, he might be led a chain'd Captive, before your triumphant Chariot : But the Concealment of your Name having deprived you of the publick Honour that is due to your Merit, you satisfy your self with the secret Pleasure of having routed your Adversary : And therefore will not grudge that a Monitor whisper in your Ear, *Respice post te, Hominem memento.*

The

INTRODUCTION.

The *Principal*, I think, has no great Cause to be ashamed of being posted upon the Title Page of your *dramatick* Performance; for you have charged him with no Error in Doctrine: The *Principal* maintains, That justifying Faith doth not consist in an Assurance of our Interest in Christ and eternal Life; and that this Assurance is not essential unto it. You own the same, and pass a severe Censure upon the Maintainers of the contrary Opinion, *Page 28, 29. That it is an unmerciful Opinion*, and that you never knew, nor heard of any godly Person who was of that Opinion; neither do you see how it can be consistent with the Experience of Religion to be so minded. The *Principal* maintains particular Redemption, and you declare, *Page 31. That you are not for universal Redemption.* Of the Scheme which the *Principal* exposed in the Appendix to his Sermon, you say, *Page 40. that you approve it not*: The only Expression of Mr. *Marshall* quarreled by the *Principal*, is, *That the Thing we are bound by the Command of God to believe, (viz. That God freely giveth Christ and Salvation to us particularly) is not a Truth before we believe it.* And you declare, *Page 19. That you cannot approve this, that the Words appear to you harsh and dangerous, and that you will have no Debate with the Principal on that Head.*

Now, Sir, when you are so well agreed in all these Points of Doctrine, what is the Ground of your Debate with the *Principal*!

Why say you, Page 5. *Your Antagonist hath mistaken the Marrow.* What then! Is this so great a Crime? You say, Page 4. *That the Matter is of very great Weight as to the Exercise of Religion.* But, pray Sir, where is the Danger to Religion, whether you or he have mistaken a Passage in a puny Writer, while you both agree in the Orthodox Doctrine? Perhaps the *Principal's* Mistake may occasion the *Marrow's* being less esteemed. But it is quite otherwise; if it be, as you represent, Page 4. *That the Book (the Marrow) is still the more indeared to many exercised unto Godliness, and of diverse Ranks.* And, by the by, 'tis a pretty odd Character you give of these Persons exercised unto Godliness, that the more this Book is suspected of Errors, and the Passages taken to Task that may lead People unto Error, yet it is still the more indeared unto them. And I doubt much, if you'll be able to name a few of the many, to whom you say the *Marrow* is still the more indeared, unless you take them of a Party, who set up for refining upon the Antinomian Scheme.

But I return to your Quarrel with the *Principal*. You say, Page 6. *'Tis strange that he should impute to the Marrow (or the great Authors from whom it is collected) such Sentiments as they don't own.* Had he arraign'd it for seeming, and some real Inconsistencies, — or Expressions not well cautioned, you would have had no Debate with him on that Head. Here you have given a publick Adver-

Advertisement how the Marrow is to be treated for the future, by any who would evite your Censure. And, 'tis Pity the *Principal* was not acquainted herewith, before the preaching and printing of his Sermon; that he might have paid a due Regard to the Directions you are here pleased to prescribe. Yet I am apt to think, that, had you or any other arraigned the *Marrow* for real Inconsistencies, it's Author would have said, *That you imputed to him such Sentiments as he did not own*, and that as an ingenuous Man he would more readily have owned what the *Principal* imputeth to him.

But was there no further Ground of Quarrel? Yes, for Page 3. *The Principal was pleased to take some worthy Authors to Task; And with them to associate the Author of the Explication of Passages excepted against in the Marrow.* And Page 6. "But that he and the Synod of Fife should have entertained and proceeded upon Mistakes, is not so easy to be accounted for, especially after that the Matter had been cleared in the *Explication of Passages excepted against in the Marrow*. Here is an *Especially* with a Witness. It seems, Sir, you have a very high Esteem of the Author of the *Explication of Passages, &c.* For here, and frequently elsewhere through your Conference, you lay great Stress on his sage Judgment: You think that it should have determined the Controversy; and others ought submissively to have acquiesced without muttering one Word against it: But, that not only

ly the *Principal*, but even the *Synod of Fife* should proceed upon Mistakes, especially after the publishing of the *Explication of Passages*, &c. is not so easy to be accounted for: Whether it be, that they are so dull and purblind, as not to see, when such a bright Author has been at Pains to set the Matter in so clear a Light; or that they are so stubborn and self-willed, as not to yield to the Authority of his superior *Genius*, I shall not determine; but leave the *Principal* and *Synod* to account the best Way they can, for the Slight and Disrespect they have put upon the worthy Author of the *Explication of Passages*, &c.

Through your deep Concern for this Author, you are sensibly touched with every Thing that seems to rub upon him. The *Principal* led the Dance to the *Synod*, this is the provoking and inexpressible Crime, for which he deserveth to be severely lashed: And accordingly you have employed your two *Scenical Persons*, to pelt him by Turns, for his daring Presumption. Grave *Epaphroditus* with an Air of Seriousness, Page 21. represents, *With all due Respect to the very reverend Principal, that he might have considered what Mr. Marshal saith for himself, as well as adduced his Arguments against him; seeing common Justice challengeth, that we hear a Man before we condemn him.* And yielding *Epaphras* is readily convinced, Page 24. *That the Principal hath mistaken, and greatly injured the Marrow, Mr. Marshal, our Reformers, and the Author of*
the

the Explication of Passages. There is one Thrust, but a more dangerous one is a coming. Judicious *Epaphroditus* hath found, Page 26. That the *Principal*, against Candor and Conscience, hath cast Iniquity upon eminent Divines, and our great *Reformers*. The Words you put in his Mouth are remarkable; "I am really in a Strait-what to judge of his Management: I cannot allow my self to think he did not so much as read the *Authors* he was determined to refute, in so open a Manner, by Word and Print; and thereby to usher a carrying the whole Matter to a *General Assembly*, and interesting the Representatives of this Church therein. And if he read them, (which I cannot but presume he did) it is beyond my Reach to reconcile his Conduct, with the Candor one might expect from a Man of his Character. It is no Christian Part, to cast Iniquity even upon our Enemies; And I would think, eminent Divines, and our great Reformers, might have been allowed fairer Treatment, than to have their Righteousness herein taken from them. Here you are intangled in a straitning *Dilemma*, whether to push at the *Principal's* Prudence, or his Honesty; and to save him from the Imputation of careless Folly, you chused rather decently to stab his Candor and Ingenuity. And pliant well-natured *Epaphras* gives the deciding Blow, Page, 27. "You have said enough; and in

" very

“ very Deed, I think the Treatment unaccountably uncharitable, &c.

Better had it been for the poor *Principal*, not to have engaged in this Conflict. Your two *dramatick Janizaries* have mauld him, and stript him of his *Candor*, *Justice*, and *Charity*. His Loss is great, how shall he recruit or recover these Forces? And without them, I would advise him never again to take the Field : Else he'll make but a sorry Hand of it, in another Engagement. But how have you so easily defeat the *Principal*? He appeared provided with some good veteran Troops of Arguments, and store of fresh Amunition, and made a brisk Attack. Hath he done no Execution? None at all, Why? Because you have used a sly Stratagem, like the *Clans* and *Spaniards* at *Glen-sheil* : You covered your *Marrow Man*, and *Marshal*, behind the ragged Rocks, and impregnable Entrenchments of your *Explication of Passages*, so that the *Principal* shot quite beside the Mark, Page 22. 26. And you have left him fighting against his chimerical *Adversary*, Page 29. a meer Phantom of his own Imagination. Yet you leave him still engaged in the Attack of a ruinous Fort, called *Assurance the Essence of Faith*, situate upon the Bottom of *Universal Redemption*, which after the retiring of your Men under the Fences of your *Explications*, remains defended only by some old gross *Antinomian* and *Libertine Invalids*, whom you have quite given up and left exposed :

The

the more refined *Antinomians*, it seems, find better Quarter.

Sir, If I have used a little Freedom in loose Railing, your dramatick Labours have inspired me with a Strain of the *comical Humor*: at least it prove offensive, I shall use more clossing.

S E C T. I.

Of the MARROW's making Assurance essential to saving Faith.

YOU begin with the *Marrow*, and I shall follow your Method. In your Conference, Page 5. You say the *Marrow* accused of a twofold Error, viz. 1. Of placing the Nature of saving Faith in the Sinners Assurance of his Interest in Christ: And, 2. Of supposing some Kind of *universal Redemption*. For its Vindication, you assert, That your Antagonist hath mistaken the *Marrow* in both his Charges. That the Reader may see with his own Eyes, and judge on what Side the Mistake is to be lodged; I shall exhibite that whole passage of the *Marrow*, Page 118, 119, 120. And again, saith he, *The Father loveth the Son*

12 Epaphroditus and Epaphras.

" Son, and hath given all Things into his Hands
 " John viii. 5. That is, he hath intrusted him
 " with the *Æconomick*, and actual Admini-
 " stration of that Power in the Church, which
 " originally belonged to himself, and hence it
 " is, that Christ also saith, *the Father judgeth*
 " *no Man, but hath committed all Judgement unto*
 " *to his Son*, John v. 22. So that all the Co-
 " venant that Believers are to have regained
 " unto for Life and Salvation, is the free and
 " gracious Covenant that is betwixt Christ
 " or God in Christ and them, and in this Co-
 " venant there is not any Condition or Law
 " to be performed on Man's Part, by him-
 " self; no, there is no more for him to do
 " but only to know and believe, that Christ
 " hath done all for him, wherefore my dear
 " Neighbour *Neophytus*, to turn my Speech
 " particularly to you, because I see you are in
 " Heaviness, I beseech you be perswaded, that
 " here you are to work nothing, here you are
 " to do nothing, here you are to render no-
 " thing to God, but only receive the Treas-
 " ure which is Jesus Christ, and apprehend
 " him in your Heart by Faith, although you
 " be never so great a Sinner, and so you shall
 " obtain forgiveness of Sins, Righteousness
 " and eternal Happiness, not as an Agent
 " but as a Patient; not by doing, but by re-
 " ceiving; nothing here cometh betwixt, but
 " Faith only, apprehending Christ in the Pro-
 " mise this then is perfect Righteousness

Review of a Conference betwixt

13

Hands to hear nothing, to know nothing, to do nothing of the Law of Works, but only to know and believe that Jesus Christ is now gone to the Father, and sitteth at his Right Hand, not as a Judge, but is made unto you of God, Wisdom, Righteousness, Sanctification and Redemption: Wherefore, as Paul and Silas said to the Jailor, so say I unto you, *believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved.* That is, be verily perswaded in your Heart, that Christ Jesus is yours, and that you shall have Life and Salvation by him, that whatever Christ did for the Redemption of Mankind, he did it for you.

“Neo. But Sir, hath such a one as I, any Warrant to believe in Christ?

“Evan. I beseech you consider, that God the Father as he is in the Son Jesus Christ, moved with nothing but with his free Love to Mankind lost, hath made a Deed of Gift and Grant unto them all, that whosoever of them all shall believe in this his Son, shall not perish, but have eternal Life, and hence it was, that Jesus Christ himself said unto his Disciples, Mark xvi, 15. *Go and preach the Gospel to every Creature under Heaven.* That is, go and tell every Man, without exception, that here is good News for him, Christ is dead for him, and if he will take him and accept of his Righteousness, he shall have him. Therefore saith a godly Writer,

‘For

" For as much as the holy Scripture speaketh to all
 " in general, none of us ought to distrust himself,
 " but believe that it doth belong particularly to him-
 " self; and to the End, this Point wherein ly-
 " eth and consisteth the whole Mystery of
 " our holy Fath, may be understood the bet-
 " ter, let us put the Case, that some good
 " and holy King, should cause a Proclamation
 " to be made through his whole Kingdom by
 " the Sound of a Trumpet, that all Rebels
 " and banished Men, shall safely return home
 " to their Houses; because at the Suit and
 " Desert of some dear Friend of theirs, it hath
 " pleased the King to pardon them, certain-
 " ly none of the Rebels ought to doubt but
 " that he shall obtain true Pardon for his
 " Rebellion, and so return home, and live un-
 " der the Shadow of that gracious King:
 " Even so our good King, the Lord of Hea-
 " ven and Earth, hath for the Obedience and
 " Desert of our good Brother Jesus Christ,
 " pardoned us all our Sins, and made a Pro-
 " clamation throughout the whole World, that
 " every one of us may safely return to God
 " through Jesus Christ; wherefore I beseech
 " you, make no doubt of it, but draw near
 " with a true Heart, in full Assurance of
 " Faith.

There are here two significant Monosyllables
 THAT IS, which in your Explication of this Pas-
 sage, you have all along put your Thumb up-
 on, that they might not glare in your Face,

But

Review of a Conference betwixt 15

But I have pointed them out in capital Letters, that they may not again escape your Observation.

I shall in the first place consider the first Charge concerning the *Marrow's* making Assurance of the Essence of Faith; and afterward proceed with you to the second, concerning his laying universal Redemption as the Foundation of the former.

In Vindication of the *Marrow*, you observe, (Conference Page 5, 6.) "That it gives a Definition of Faith, which is in Substance the same with that of our *Westminster Divines*, in their *Shorter Catechism*; or rather it quotes the famous *Martin Luther*, who defined it by receiving and apprehending of *Jesus Christ, &c.* In his excellent Commentary upon the Epistle to the *Gal.* Pag. 69, and 194." This Definition of Faith quoted out of *Luther*, is in Pag. 118 of the *Marrow*. But you quickly *Metamorphose* these very Words from a Definition of Faith, into the beginning of an Exhortation to seek Assurance. Your Words are, *Confer.* Pag. 11. "It is not the Scope of the *Marrow* to give a Definition of Faith, in the Words blamed, viz. Be verily perswaded in your Heart, that *Jesus Christ* is yours, &c. They only contain an Exhortation to seek Assurance, about which there is no debate; and the whole Connexion bears this, tho' the *Principal* took not any Notice thereof: View " the

“the beginning of the Exhortation, *Pag.* 118.
 “Of the *Marrow*, in these Words, where-
 “fore my dear Neighbour Neophytus &c. I be-
 “seech you be perswaded, that here you are to work
 “nothing,——but only to receive the Treasure
 “which is Jesus Christ, and apprehend him in
 “your Heart by Faith,—and so shall you obtain
 “forgiveness of Sins. And at the Foot of the
 “*Pag.* are quoted *Reynold's* on *Psal.* cx. *Pag.* 7.
 [This is a Blunder, for *Reynolds* is cited on
 another Head at the Letter (A) “And
 “*Luther* on *Gal.* *pag.* 69, 194. And the Ex-
 “hortation is accordingly continued in the
 “same Tenor.

Here seems to be a manifest confounding
 of an Exhortation with a Definition. You blame
 the Principal for this, *Confer. pag.* 30. “Touch-
 “ing what the Principal fathers upon the *Mar-*
 “*row* as a Definition of Faith,——it cannot
 “be called the Definition of any Thing, being
 “just an Exhortation, unless we confound Ex-
 “hortations with Definitions, which it is not
 “presumable any Man of Sense will do.” Yet
 Sir, you make the Author of the *Marrow* here
 to confound Exhortations with Definitions; and
 consequently, in your Opinion, it is not pre-
 sumable, he was a Man of Sense; to what
 purpose then shall we contend further about his
 Sense and Meaning? Had any other thus treat-
 ed your darling *Marrow*; he had been injuri-
 ous and unaccountably uncharitable. But it seems
 you reserve to your self the Privilege of vin-
 dicating

indicating an Author by making him devoid of Sense.

Further, when you make the very same Words of the *Marrow*, to be both a Definition of Faith, and an Exhortation to seek Assurance? Do you not charge it with a seeming or real Inconsistency? But I believe you will have no debate with your self on that Account; *Self Contradiction being a fault into which Compilers may readily fall*: Seeing you have declared, *Confer. pag. 6. That you would have had no debate with the Principal on that Head*. Well, when the *Marrow*, as you say, gives a Definition of Faith, is distinct from Assurance, in the Words of the famous *Martin Luther*, who defined it by *receiving and apprehending* of Jesus Christ; doth it not exhort unto that same Faith that was defined, when in the same Words, it saith, "I beseech you be perswaded, that here you are to work nothing,——but only to receive the Treasure, which is Jesus Christ, and apprehend him in your Heart by Faith: And is not the Exhortation accordingly continued in the same Tenor, in the Words of *Paul and Silas* to the Jailor, *believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved*. THAT IS, be verily perswaded that Jesus Christ is yours, and that you shall have Life and Salvation by him: No, say you, the *Marrow* doth not exhort unto the same Faith it had defined; but (*Confer. pag. 11.*) *exhorts to seek Assurance,——View the beginning of the Exhortation, pag. 118, &c. And the Exhortation, is accordingly continued in the same*

Tenor. And *Confer. Pag. 13.* "It is not the
 " Purpose in Hand, in that Place, to treat
 " the Nature of Faith explicately, the Gospel
 " Minister hath to do with the Conscience
 " of a Believer, who hath already received Christ,
 " and apprehended him by saving Faith, which
 " our Author doth not explain to be the Sinners
 " perswading himself that Christ hath died for
 " him: In this he placeth not the Essence of
 " it; but exhorteth the true Believer to receive
 " and intertain that Perswasion,——that
 " Christ hath died for him." Whether this
 be to explain or contradict the *Marrow*, and
 whether the *Marrow* it self, or your Explica-
 tion of it, hath least of Self-Contradiction, I
 leave it to the unbiaſſed Reader to judge.

The *Principal* in his Sermon, had advanced
 ſome Reasons from the Scope, Circumstances,
 and expreſs Words of the Paſſage above re-
 cited; to prove that the Author of the *Mar-
 row of Modern Divinity*, was of Opinion, that
 a Sinners Perswasion of his particular Interest
 in Christ is eſſential unto ſaving Faith. You
 exhibite the *Principal's* Reasons pretty fully,
Confer. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. You call them over again,
 more briefly, *Pag. 11.* But you meddle with none
 of them in particular; excepting one of the
 weakeſt of them, about the *Note* at the Foot of the
 Page, *Confer. Pag. 17.* of which afterward. Yet you
 are pleaſed to paſs your Judgement on them by the
 Lump, *Page 12.* *That theſe Reasons will not at all*
bear out the Principal in his Representation; for

he hath quite mistaken his Mark. This may suffice for such as depend upon your Word. If any be more curious and inquisitive, and are not fully satisfied, they may seek after particular Answers for themselves.

However, to set the Matter in a clearer Light, you have (in Opposition to the *Principal's* Opinion, and all the Reasons he adduced to support it) condescended to vouchsafe us an Exposition of your own: I say *your own*; because I believe it to be so, and that the Author of the *Marrow* himself never once dreamed of it: You set it forth, *Confer.* Page 12, 13. And it is in short. 1. *That Neophytus with whom Evangelista hath to do in this Passage of the Marrow, is a real Believer; tho' labouring under Darknes and Doubts.* 2. *That being a Believer, who hath already received Christ, and apprehended him by saving Faith; Evangelista doth here exhort him to intertain that Perswasion, that Christ hath died for him.* Here I shall do you the honour to consider the particular Grounds on which you build this your Explication. And I shall first examine your *Supposition*, and then the *Inference* you deduce from it.

Your *Supposition* is, that *Neophytus* is considered as a real Believer, who hath already received Christ, and apprehended him by saving Faith. How prove you this? *The Words*, (say you, Page 12.) are express, viz. *Wherefore my dear Neighbour Neophytus, to turn my Speech particularly, N. B. To you, because you are in Hea-*
vineſs,

vinefs, I befeech you, &c. Pray Sir, where are the *exprefs* and *very exprefs Words*, which here declare *Neophytus* to be a real Believer? I profefs I need your Spectacles to fee them, for I cannot difcern, how this is even fo much as *implied* in thefe Words. Is it in the Compellation given to *Neophytus*, *Dear Neighbour*? This is a civil Term, and is not ufed to denote the reality of Faith. Is it in the following Words, where you place your Mark of Observation, *N. B. To turn my Speech particularly, N. B. to you?* But may not a Gospel Miniſter turn his Speech to an unconverted Sinner, to call him to believe; as well as to a real Believer? Is it then in thefe Words, *because you are in Heavinefs?* No, for ſurely you'll grant, that an awakened Sinner may be in Heavinefs, under the Terrours of Law,—Vengeance, and Apprehenſions of divine Wrath, who is not as yet come the Length of being a real Believer. Yet you ſay, *the Words are very exprefs.* Truly Sir, I think your Words do exprefs your Perſwaſion of your Reader's Emptinefs, when you ſtand not to impoſe ſo groſſly upon his Credulity. But I crave your Pardon for an Omiſſion; I did not take Notice of the laſt Words of your Quotation, *viz. I befeech you, &c.* Perhaps the Words may be very exprefs in this, *&c.* and you'll ſet this Point in a clearer Light in your next Edition.

I expected you would have confirmed your Suppoſition of *Neophytus's* being a real Believer,

ver, from some other *Topick*: Such as the Description of the *Interlocutors* in the Beginning of this Dialogue, *Marrow* Page 1. Where *Neophytus* is described, a young Christian. But even this would have done you no Service. For in this *dramatick* Work, *Neophytus* is designed to be made *Evangelista's* Convert: He is not brought in as a true Convert at first, but is in the same State and Condition with *Nomista*. He is not come the Length of a real Believer at Page 118. Where *Evangelista* turns his Speech to him; for Page 119. He puts the Question, *Hath such an one as I, any Warrant to believe in Christ?* And in the following Pages he proposeth his Doubts and Objections, and in the Author's Method, he is not brought to be a real Believer till Page 142. And thereafter, being further instructed in the Law of Christ and Christian Duties, he is brought in enquiring about Assurance by the reflex Act, or believing that he doth believe, as this Author is pleased to express it, Page 220.

But Sir, you will have *Neophytus* to be a real Believer, who hath already received Christ, and apprehended him by saving Faith, at Page 118. of the *Marrow*: For this is your *Supposition* and the Ground of your Explication of the Passage under debate. Well, let us consider what kind of Person he is, by the Description and Characters that are given of him in the preceeding Part of this Dialogue; for

so must we judge of *Persons* that are brought upon the Stage in such *dramatick* Books.

The first Account we have of him is at *Page 2*. *Antinomista* would perswade him to believe in Christ, though he be never so sinful in Heart and Life: But he says of himself, that he cannot believe, and thinks he ought not so to do. Then in your Judgement, he is a real Believer, who cannot, and thinks he ought not to believe in Christ: The next Time we meet with *Neophytus* is at *Page 93*. And there he concludes absolutely that he is far from Christ: Because *Evangelista* had questioned his Neighbour *Nomista's* State, whom he judged much farther advanced than himself. And *Evangelista* declares his Hopes to *Neophytus*, not of what he then was, but of what he might be afterwards: Truly, saith he, *for ought I know, you may be in Christ before him*. And *Page 104, 105*. *Evangelista* explains this, by comparing *Nomista* to the *Pharisee*, and *Neophytus* to the *Publican*, saying, That as the *Pharisee* had more to do before he could come at Christ, than the *Publican* had, so *Nomista* had more to do than *Neophytus*. Is he then a true Believer, who is hitherto but in the State of the *Publican*, that is not yet come to Christ?

Again, at *Page 106, 107*. *Neophytus* describes his own State, that his Conscience had been awakened in a Fit of Sickness; that he had been brought under Terror on Account of his wicked and sinful Life, that for Relief he had re-

solved

solved to reform, that accordingly he was going on in this Course, but came far short of his Neighbour *Nemista*, who, in *Evangelista's* Opinion, was not in a good Condition, and therefore concludes himself to be in a miserable Condition. Hence *Evangelista* perceives that it is Time to open up to him the Gospel Mystery, and shew, how in the fulness of Time was performed, what God had purposed and promised concerning the helping and delivering of fallen Mankind. And we meet with no more of *Neophytus* till at Page 118. where *Evangelista* turns his Speech to him, as a Man in Heaviness; and exhorteth him to receive Jesus Christ, and apprehend him in his Heart by Faith.

This being the State of *Neophytus*, if you will still have him supposed to be already a real Believer; you must allow a Man to be a real Believer, who is seeking Righteousness by the Works of the Law, and concludes himself Miserable because of his short coming therein: And at farthest, upon the proposal of the Gospel, is but brought to enquire, if such an one as he, hath any Warrant to believe in Christ: Are these the Characters of a real Believer? Surely you will not say it. *Evangelista* himself did not judge *Neophytus* to be a real Believer at Page 118. when after that, he is still at so much Pains to answer his Objections, and to perswade him to believe. And (which may put this Matter beyond all Doubt) he says of him, at Page 148. *As I conceive he did not believe*

lieve in Christ before this Time. And Page 261. *Neophytus* himself says, *Surely Sir, I never knew Christ before this Day, viz.* Of their happy Conference. It might have been expected of one who undertook the Defence and Vindication of a Book, that he would have acquainted himself better, with the Plan and Design of its Author. I might here retort the *Dilemma* wherewith you press the Principal, *Confer. Page 26.* Either you did not read the *Marrow*, which you determined to defend. Or if you read it (which I cannot but presume you did,) it is beyond my reach to reconcile; — but I forbear. Enough hath been said to shew, how groundless your Supposition is; I shall proceed to consider your *Inference*.

And I must observe to you, that your *Inference* is as groundless as your Supposition; for I shall grant you, (what hath been evinced to be false,) that *Neophytus* in the Passage under Debate, is a real Believer, but in Heaviness; it will not hence follow that *Evangelista* is exhorting him to seek Assurance, as a Duty consequent upon his believing: But perceiving him to be in Heaviness, under Darknes, and in Doubts about his State, he may very well exhort him unto the first and direct Acts of Faith, that, for his present Relief and Establishment, he may renew these; and again receive Jesus Christ, and apprehend him in his Heart by Faith. And this is more agreeable unto the usual Sense and Meaning of the Words of the Exhortation, *viz.*

261. I beseech you be perswaded, that here you are to work
 knew nothing, — but only to receive the Treasure, which
 Con- is Jesus Christ; and apprehend him in your Heart
 of one by Faith, — and so shall you obtain forgiveness of
 ation Sins. — Wherefore as Paul and Silas said to the
 him- Jailor, so say I unto you, believe on the Lord Je-
 of its sus Christ and thou shalt be saved. But tho' these
 lemma Words, in their usual Meaning, be expressive
 Page of the direct and essential Acts of saving Faith;
 which yet the Author of the Marrow gives such an Ex-
 ad it position of them, as brings in Assurance of a Man's
 it is particular Interest in Christ into the Essence of
 I for- Faith. Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ. THAT
 how is, (saith he,) be verily perswaded in your Heart
 pro- that Jesus Christ is yours, &c. However while you
 profess to hold, that this Assurance is not essential
 to saving Faith, you overturn your own In-
 ference, unless you also maintain, that a Gospel
 I shall Minister must not exhort and press a real Be-
 (false,) liever under Darkness, to exert the Acts of re-
 debate, ceiving and apprehending Christ; which I think
 will not you will not do.

g him upon
 be in
 about
 n unto
 at, for
 e may
 Christ,
 : And
 se and
 n, viz.
 I

And thus your Exposition being found ground-
 less, you have failed in setting this Matter in a
 clearer Light: And withal you have given Oc-
 casion unto the further Confirmation of the
 genuine Meaning of this Author, which the
 Principal advanced in his Sermon; and if he
 give not in this Place an Account of his Opi-
 nion concerning the Nature of saving Faith;
 but is only exhorting to seek Assurance; then
 he omits it in the most proper Place, and ex-
 horts

horts to seek Assurance, before he exhorts unto saving Faith it self.

Confer. Page 14. You confidently conclude your Explication with a flat Contradiction to the Text of the *Marrow*: Which is the Gloss of *Orleans*, if ever there was any. Your Words are, *Neither doth the Marrow teach the Object of justifying Faith to be, Christ is yours, and that the Act, is a firm Perswasion thereof: That's not the Thing treated in the quarrelled Places.* Let the *Marrow* be inspected, and it will evidently appear, that *Evangelista* or the Gospel Minister is dealing with *Neophytus* as a convinced Sinner, unto whom he is opening up the Gospel Mystery of Salvation and Covenant of Grace; wherein not Works of our own Righteousness, but Faith receiving Christ is required. And in exhorting unto this Faith, he compares *Neophytus* to the Jailor, *Acts* xvi. saying, *Wherefore as Paul and Silas said to the Jailor, so say unto you, believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.* That this Faith, to which the Jailor is exhorted, is justifying saving Faith will be evident to any who considers the whole Context: *Acts* xvi. 27. The wicked Jailor drew out his Sword, and would have killed him self, Verse 28. Paul cries to him, *Do thy self no harm.* Before he calleth him to believe, he exhorts him to lay aside his horrid Design of self-Murther: The Apostle did not think it unsound to teach him to relinquish this Sin in order to his coming to Christ and being instate

unto
 e your
 to the
 oss of
 Words
 ject of
 hat the
 at's not
 Let
 idently
 Mini-
 vinced
 e Gos-
 Grace
 ousness
 And
 res Ne-
 Where
 so say
 rist and
 o which
 g Faith
 e whole
 d Jailor
 led him
 o thy se-
 lieve, b
 Design
 think
 this Sin-
 nd being
 instate

instated in Covenant with God, Verse 29, 30. The Jailor came trembling and fell down, before Paul and Silas, and said, Sirs, what shall I do to be saved? He is suddenly convinced, humbled and brought into an anxious Concern about his Salvation. And Verse 31. *They said believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.* Now the Man being in this Case, and proposing this Question, pray, What must that Faith be, which the Apostle exhorts him unto? Surely it can be no other, than justifying saving Faith, which hath the Promise annexed. The Principal sheweth this sufficiently and briefly, but you give no answer to what he proposed; *Serm. Page 25.* "The Author of the Marrow speaks of that Faith, whereby a Sinner hath Interest in Christ, and is entered into the Covenant of Grace: That Faith which a convinced Sinner, such as the Jailor was, is directly and immediately called unto by the Gospel. That Faith which the awakened Sinner is exhorted unto, in answer to that weighty Question, *What shall I do to be saved?* And that Faith, which hath Salvation annexed to it. And therefore it is justifying saving Faith it self, that he treats of; and not any Fruit or Consequent of it." It being then justifying Faith, which the Apostle exhorts the Jailor unto, let us see what Account the Author of the Marrow gives of it; *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.* THAT IS, (saith he,) be verily perswaded in your Heart, That Jesus Christ

28 *Review of a Conference betwixt*

is yours, &c. Now Sir, doth not the *Marrow* here teach the Object of justifying Faith to be, *Christ is yours?* Doth it not also teach, that the A& is a firm Perswasion thereof? Be verily perswaded. And while you so confidently deny this, do you not by your Gloss, plainly contradict the Text of the *Marrow*?



S E C T. II.

Of the Principal's alledged chief Proof, and of his accusing the Reformers.

I Find no particular Answer to any of the Reasons wherewith the *Principal* supports this first Charge against the *Marrow*, except at Page 17. of your Confer. Where you say, "I had almost forgotten the *Principal's* main Proof, from whence he concludes, that the *Marrow* placeth the Essence of Faith in Assurance, viz. Page 25 of his Sermon, where, after these Words, be verily perswaded in your Heart, that Jesus Christ is yours, &c." There's marked in the Foot of the Page, a *Definition of Faith*.

Here you are to shew your Wit, in exposing your Antagonist's Weakness. But before you come

come to grapple with him, you slyly slip on him a Fool's Hood of your own making; and when you set him forth on your Stage, as so shallow and ridiculous, that he chused for his main Proof, this Note on the Foot of the Page. In this you expect the Applause of your credulous Admirers, with whom every Thing goes slyly down, upon the Authority of your Word. But to make it pass with others, who have Eyes in their Fore-heads, you should have fallen on some Way of Hood-winking them, that they might not discern the Cunning. For the judicious Reader will easily observe, how unwarily you have furnished an Antidote against the Poison, by citing so much of the Principal's Sermon, Confer. Page 6, 7, 8. For there you exhibite, First, What the *Principal* had represented of the Words of the *Marrow*, where he took Notice of this Note on the Foot of the Page. And then you repeat the Grounds and Reasons, from which the *Principal* evinceth the Opinion of the *Marrow*: Where he is so far from making this Note his main Proof, that he doth not so much as mention it, or give the least Insinuation of it, by referring to it. The Text of the *Marrow* afforded such abundant Evidence of its Author's Meaning, that he had no Occasion of recurring unto this Note on the Foot of the Page for his main Proof.

The Reader will also readily observe your Curtailing what you here quote from Page

25. of the Sermon. Which looks somewhat blunt ; because you omit the Apostle's Words to the Jailor, and the Authors Note of Explication, *THAT IS* ; which as represented by the *Principal*, in Connection with the Words you quote, make it evident that the Author designed them for a Description of Faith. For, as an Explication of the Apostles Words, *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ*, he saith, *THAT IS*, *Be verily persuaded in your Heart, that Jesus Christ is yours*, &c. And seeing the Words, *THAT IS* are the usual Indication of a Description of the Thing spoken of ; the whole very patly answers unto the *Note* on the Foot of the Page viz. *Definition of Faith*.

But what Return make you to this Argument, which you have thus patched up for the *Principal's* main Proof. " This Prop (say you) " is too weak for so great a Weight that's laid " upon it." And you have two Reasons of its Weakness in the following Words ; " For, " The (a.) here is only a Note in the *Marrow* " now, pointing to somewhat answerable in the " Foot of the Page." A profound and notable Remark ! Reader, take Notice of it for it might have escaped your Observation *That the (a.) here is only a Note in the Marrow pointing to somewhat answerable in the Foot of the Page* : And you'll certainly be convinced of the Weakness of this Prop. But you add another, 2. *I still took that which the Professor calleth, A Definition of Faith, for the Name*

newha
Words
Expli
by the
rds you
design
For, a
Belieu
is, B
s Chri
HAT is
of the
ly an
e Page
Argu
for the
ay you
at's lai
ns of it
For,
ne Mar
le in the
and not
e of it
servatio
Marrow
Foot
convinced
you ad
e Profess
Name
som

same Book. Well, seeing you still took it so, the Prop is now sufficiently weakned. But you are at a Loss, that you have not yet seen the Book, only you resolve to be at Pains to find it out. And I think the *Principal* needs be in no Pain about it, and while you are in Quest of the Book, he may quit you this Proof without Prejudice, seeing his other Props stand hitherto unshaken. But what think you of the Author of the *Explication of Passages excepted against in the Marrow*, who says this, Passage is quoted out of Culverwell on Faith Page 15. who Culverwell saith nothing like it. See *Explication of Passages*, Page 14. You more ingenuously own, you never saw the Book from which this Passage is quoted. But how say you then, in the Close of this Paragraph, Confer. Page 18.

The *Principal* might have spared his Labour, in ascribing to great Men such Sentiments as they do not own." Pray Sir, who are these great Men? You confess you have not yet seen the Book, out of which you alledge this Passage to be quoted; and when you know neither the Author's Name nor Book; how know you him to have been a great Man? But seeing he is quoted by the Author of the *Marrow*, as you still took it, he must be so: And these two make great Men.

But perhaps these two great Men may come to be imbodyed into one, in the Person of the Author of the *Marrow*. I shall tell you a Story,

which

32 *A Review of a Conference betwixt*

which, if you please, you may carry along with you, while you are on the Search after the Book of that great Man. The Title whereof you took to be, *Definition of Faith*. In the first two or three Editions of the *Marrow*, that Note is wanting, as also the whole Gloss on *Acts* xvi. 31. which is relative unto it, viz. THAT IS, *Be verily persuaded, That Jesus Christ is yours, &c.* In Anno 1646, there was published by one J. A. a small Treatise, intituled; *A manifest and brief Discovery of some of the Errors contained in a Dialogue called, The Marrow of Modern Divinity*. This Author accuseth the *Marrow* of *Antinomian* Opinions; tells that it was then come to the third Edition; and finds Fault, that it gave no Definition of justifying Faith; for Page 7. he saith, "He, (the Author of the *Marrow*)
 " seems not to know what Regeneration is;
 " for he hath never mentioned it in all his Books,
 " nor what Repentance is, nor how we come
 " to this excellent Gift of Faith; nor tells
 " what it is, but only that we must believe in
 " Christ, and take Christ; but who is the
 " Worker of this Faith, he tells us not; but
 " speaks of it, as if it were in our Power to
 " believe." And Page 14. "The Author hath
 " so much spoken of Faith and of Believing,
 " yet hath not told us what this Faith is." I have not inspected the fourth Edition of the *Marrow*; but in the fifth Edition, Anno 1647, corrected by the Author, this Gloss on *Acts* xvi. 31.

is added in the End of Page 117, and Beginning of Page 118, and over against it in the Margin *Definition of Faith*; (for the Marginal Notes were not then carried down to the Foot of the Page) These Things being Matters of Fact, may afford Occasion to some to form a Conjecture, that this Gloss on *Acts* xvi 31. was added by the Author of the *Marrow*, as a Description of saving Faith, to make up the Defect, for which the Book had been quarreled by Mr. J. A. And to make the Supplement the more observable, in Answer to the Exception, he placed on the Margin this *Note, Definition of Faith*. And as Mr. J. A. takes in Assurance into his Definition of Faith. Page 14. so doth the Author of the *Marrow* in this his Description of it, by Way of Gloss or Paraphrase on *Acts* xvi. 31.

Sir, when you shall have found out the Book, called *Definition of Faith*, from which this Gloss is quoted; you may favour the Publick with a Confutation of this Conjecture: And you may also give some Account of the Author of the Book, that it may be known how great a Man he was.

This leads me to consider what followeth, *Confer.* Page 18. Having told, That the renowned Mr. *Marshal*, as well as the Author of the *Marrow*, is said to place the Nature of saving Faith in Assurance, you add, *I need not repeat that the Principal ought rather to have accused the Reformers and other worthy Men quoted in the*

Marrow. But, Sir, why not repent? 'Tis such a valuable Thought, that you repeat it over and over seven Times in your small Pamphlet. I believe you owe it to the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, who insists much upon it. And it is of no small Advantage, when artfully used. For by representing the *Marrow* as a Collection of choice Truths, gathered from the Writings of the *Reformers*, and other worthy Men, you at once highly commend it, and screen it from every Attack. And if any Man shall be so bold as to find Fault with any Passage in it; he shall be sure to be loaded with being injurious and disrespectful to our worthy *Reformers* and eminent *Divines*. And thus you have served the *Principal* for presuming to quarrel one Passage in it: And what Treatment may the *Snake*, &c. expect, who hath charged it with so many Errors?

Yet, Sir, this useful Artifice should be prudently managed, lest, if narrowly looked into, it be found to have more of Noise and Clamor than solid Reason. For, in the *first* Place, tho' we owe a due Regard to the fragrant Memory of worthy *Reformers* and eminent *Divines*; yet we are not to receive every Thing for infallible Truth, which dropt from them, as if they had been secured from all Error and Mistake. That our Belief of sacred Truths should depend on the Authority of fallible Men, is no *Reformation* Principle; but would have intirely stopt it, if yielded unto, as is well observed by the learned

learned Bishop of *Bangor*, that great Assertor of the Rights of Mankind, in his excellent *Answer* to the Report of the Committee of the lower House of *Convocation*. If nothing may be blamed that hath been advanced by some of the *Reformers*, or eminent *Divines*, without being injurious to them: Then, we may not find Fault with *Luther's* Opinion of the Sacrament, and his retaining the Popish Images in the Churches. Now, if the Author of the *Marrow* has cull'd out any Mistakes *Sphalmata*, or harsh Positions of otherwise great Men; it is no sufficient Defence to say in his Favour, that these are not his own, they are only Quotations from other Authors: For whatever he cites with Approbation, and so adopts for his own, he is justly chargeable with it.

Besides, every Author cited in the *Marrow* is not therefore to be accounted a Reformer or worthy Divine. *Bernardine Ochine*, tho' he lived in the Time of the REFORMATION, was a Ring-leader to the *Socinian* Heresy. In his Dialogues, he sily attempted the overturning of the Doctrine of the Trinity, and Satisfaction of Christ: For which being banished from *Zurich*, and afterwards from *Basil*, he retired to *Poland*, where he lived and died in the *Socinian* Society. Yet he is cited several Times in the *Marrow*, and at Page 190, with the Applause of a Man much enlightened in the Knowledge of the Gospel. And the very worthy Author

of the *Explication of Passages*, does him also the Honour to quote him, *vide* Page 16.

Again, every Opinion of the Author of the *Marrow*, for which he adduceth an Author, is not therefore to be judged the Opinion of that Author; because he may mistake or misrepresent his Meaning. Indeed the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, &c. Page 4. saith, He is SURE the Author of the *Marrow* is not, or is not willingly guilty of unfair Citation. I durst not say so far in his Favour, unless I had compared his Quotations with the Works of about threescore Writers that are cited by him. Whether the Author of the *Explication of Passages* hath been at that Pains, I know not. I shall give one Instance, *Marrow* Page 30. for a Ground of his Opinion, *That Adam fell the same Day he was created*, he cites, *Psal. xlix. 12.* with Mr. *Ainsworth's* Version and Annotations thereon: Upon the Faith of the *Marrow*, it seems the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, took this for Mr. *Ainsworth's* Opinion; for Page 7. he says "All I see, that can be
" inferred from this, amounts to no more, but
" that our Author quotes a learned Divine's O-
" pinion, *viz.* Dr. *Ainsworth*. But upon Inspection of *Ainsworth* on *Psal. xlix.* no such Opinion will be found. He doth indeed in his Version render Ver. 13. thus: *But Man in Honour doth not lodge-a-Night*; using a Compound to express the proper Signification of the Hebrew
117 which the Author of the *Marrow* represents

sents without the Marks of Composition, *not lodge a Night*, as if *Ainsworth's* Meaning were *Adam* in Honour did not lodge one Night. And in his second Edition, Page 29. (before he was quarreled by Mr. *J. A.* for corrupting this Text) he says, this Text in the Hebrew is thus read, *Adam being in Honour did not lodge a Night in it.* But *Ainsworth* in his Annotations prevents the Mistake, and explains this Phrase, by not continuing "And this (saith "he) may be minded both for the first Man *Adam*, "who continued not in his Dignity; and so for all "his Children." And yet more expressly, "Not "lodge a Night, or, not continue. The Word, "tho' it properly signifies a Night's Lodging "or abiding, — yet is used also for longer "Continuance." And for Confirmation he cites, *Psal.* xxv. 13. where it is said of him that feareth the LORD, *His Soul shall dwell at Ease*: In the Hebrew it is *רוּחַ נְטוּי* shall lodge in Goodness: Which being a Promise of the new Covenant, cannot be restricted to one Night's Lodging. He cites also *Psal.* lv. 8. and *Zach.* v. 8. to the same Purpose. And if *Ainsworth* had thought that *Adam's* falling the same Day he was created, was proved from this Text, he would not readily have advanced such Reasons against it, and yet have said nothing for it.

Moreover the Author of the *Marrow*, hath Opinions of his own, and of the *Antinomian* Strain; as some have observed, and may yet

further be evinced : And the taxing of these is not to be branded with the odious Reproach of injuring our Reformers.

But to come more closely to the Point, why say you, that the *Principal* ought rather to have accused the *Reformers*, and other worthy Men? seeing, as you affirm, Page 27. our *Reformers* disown this Opinion; and Page 29. You see not how it can consist with the Experience of Religion, to be so minded. Why should he have accused our Reformers, who, (as you say) disown this Opinion, rather than the Author of the *Marrow*, who holds it, as the *Principal* hath proved from his own Words? But you wanted an Occasion of loading the *Principal* with injuring the Reformers, as you do, Page 25, 26. tho' in his Sermon he did not so much as mention our Reformers upon this Head. When you are so foreward to pick Quarrels with the *Principal*, what a great Advantage would you have had against him; had he expressed himself, as doth the Author of the *Explication of Passages*? His Words, Page, 13, 14. are, " Our Author (of the *Marrow*) is blamed for
 " defining Faith in Terms that import Assur-
 " rance : The Words are — *Be verily perswa-*
 " *ded in your Heart, that Jesus Christ is yours,*
 " *and that you shall have Life and Salvation by him,*
 " *&c.* And for this quotes *Culverwell* on
 " Faith, Page 15. It is obvious to remark
 " hereupon, that our Author intended not to
 " give a Definition of Faith in these Words:
 " tho'

“ tho’ yet our Reformers generally defined it by Assurance. ” And if so, then the Reformers generally defin’d Faith in Terms which import Assurance. And I suppose, what will be readily granted, that their Definition contained what they conceived to be essential to the Thing defined. And therefore in this Author’s Opinion, they held Assurance to be of the Nature and Essence of Faith. Thus he imputes to our Reformers, what you and he will not have imputed to the *Marrow*. But this worthy Author, because he is your dear Friend, must be more gently treated. He, good Man, must have the Privilege of imputing to our great Reformers, what you say they do not own; and of casting upon them, what you call Iniquity; and yet be blameless. Yet the *Principal*, who mentioned not the Reformers at all, must be brought in guilty, and condemned for your Friends Fault.

But, you say, the Reformers, and other worthy Men are quoted in the *Marrow*; and therefore the *Principal* ought rather to have accused them. Now, pray Sir, who are the Reformers, or worthy Men quoted upon this Head, for which the *Principal* blames the *Marrow*? He found Fault with that Author, because of his Gloss upon the Apostles Words to the *Taylor*, Page, 119. *Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved; THAT IS, Be verily persuaded in your Heart, That Jesus Christ is yours, &c.* For this there is neither Reformer, nor other

40 *A Review of a Conference betwixt*

other worthy Man quoted; only answerable thereunto, there is the *Note* on the Foot of the Page, *Definition of Faith*: Which you conjecture to be the Name of some Book, but whether its Author be a *Reformer*, or other worthy Man, you have not yet learned. And so the Matter stands, of which before.



S E C T. III.

Of Universal Redemption charged upon the
M A R R O W.

I proceed to the *second Charge*. The *Principal* says of the Author of the *Marrow*; “That for a Foundation of this Faith, or
“firm Perswasion, he supposeth some Kind of
“universal Redemption, and thereupon a Gift
“and Promise of eternal Life to Mankind; and
“that every one under the Gospel Dispensation, is called to make Application of this to
“himself in particular; and verily to perswad
“himself, that whatsoever Christ did for the
“Redemption of Mankind, was done for him,
“and that the Gift of eternal Life belongs to
“him in particular.” And that this is the Author’s

Epaphroditus and Epaphras. 41

thor's true Meaning, the *Principal* confirms from what follows in the *Marrow*, *vid. Sermon*, Page 27. Your Reply to this is (*Confer.* Page 17.) That the *Explication of Passages* answereth this Charge, Page 15. And you again complain that the *Principal* took no Notice of it. This was his Fault. He should have acquiesced in what was so well said in the *Explication of Passages*, rather than have searched into the Meaning of the *Marrow* from the Author's own Words: And so have eased you of the *uneasy Necessity of repeating*. This disrespectful Slight put upon the worthy Author of the *Explication of Passages*, quickens your *magisterial Briskness* in what follows: **KNOW THEN** (Reader, open your Eyes, and receive this bright Sunbeam of Knowledge, and it shall certainly enlighten you, if it be not faltered in some Fog by the Way,) **KNOW THEN, 1.** *That in sundry Places of the Marrow, particular Redemption is taught:* The Inference is plain; therefore no Kind of universal Redemption is asserted in this Passage, and your Antagonist hath mistaken the *Marrow*. For Answer to this Argument if you would allow me what you granted to the *Principal* (*Confer.* Page 6.) That, *had he arraign'd it for some real Inconsistencies, a Fault into which Compilers may readily fall, you would have had no Debate with him on that Head:*) I would for once adventure to charge the *Marrow* with a real Inconsistency, in asserting both an universal and particular Redemption; and so,

whatever

whatever he may say elsewhere, that he maintains some Kind of universal Redemption in the Passage under Debate. If it be accounted Insolence in me, to claim a Privilege, which perhaps you have granted only to *Principals*: I shall make shift without it. And therefore.

I shall, in the *first* Place, consider the four Passages in the *Marrow*, which you refer unto. The *first* is in the Preface, "Jesus Christ the second *Adam*, did as a common Person, enter into Covenant with God his Father, for all the Elect (that is to say, *all those that have or shall believe on his Name*) and for them kept it, whereby they become righteous, and Heirs of everlasting Life and Salvation." Here is a Description of the Elect that *Arminius* himself would have subscribed, that they are such who have or shall believe on Christ, *viz.* According as God, *per Scientiam mediam*, did foresee. And *Arminius* will grant, that for such Christ did enter into Covenant with God, and for them kept it, whereby they are made righteous and Heirs, &c. yea, and undertook that they shall be actually saved, according to the Promise, *He that believeth shall be saved*: Nevertheless they maintain an universal Redemption, that Christ died for all Mankind, so as to render God placable, and every one of them salvable, and to procure for them a Right unto eternal Life, to be conferred in Case they shall believe. The *second* Passage you refer to, is *Marrow* Page 29. The *second Adam*, Christ, is
called

called the Lord from Heaven, who had all the Elect included in him, who are said to be the First-Born, and to have their Names written in Heaven. Arminians will grant this likewise under the former Explication of the *Elect*, and maintain still their universal Redemption. The third is, Page 62. where the Words, as I conceive, referred to are, *In these Covenants Jesus Christ is the Subject Matter of both, Salvation the Fruit of both, and Faith the Condition of both.* Wherein I find nothing to the Purpose of particular Redemption. The fourth is, Page 110, where I find again nothing about particular Redemption; but as to the Conditionality of Faith, it is said, "Even so whatsoever Christ did or befell him, it is to be reckoned as to have been done by Believers, and to have befallen them.—— Even so in Respect of Faith, whereby Believers are ingrafted into Christ and spiritually made one with him; they did all in him, and with him, satisfy the Justice of God in his Death and Sufferings." And the Arminians may easily grant, that the Grace impetrated by Christ, is made effectual only to Believers. These are the sundry Places of the *Marrow*, mentioned in the *Explication of Passages*. And that indefatigable Writer might have shewed how they made for his Purpose.

But, in the next Place, I shall yield to you that the *Marrow* in these Places, doth teach a particular Election, not upon the Arminian foreseen

foreseen Faith, but of free Grace and distinguishing Love; yet it doth not thence follow, that he doth not maintain an universal *Redemption*, Page 119, 120, and elsewhere, for there are, and were Men in the World. who think these not inconsistent. The Divines of *Saumur* taught a particular Election of free Love; and Faith wrought in the Elect by efficacious Grace: Nevertheless they maintained an universal *Redemption*. Mr. *Baxter* affirms, that Christ died with a special Intention of bringing infalibly, immutably, and insuperably certain chosen Persons to saving Faith, Justification and Salvation, and yet in that same Book, he endeavours by thirty Arguments to establish an universal *Redemption*. The *Antinomians* hold particular Election, and yet assert an universal *Redemption*: For which they are blamed by *Hoornbeck*, *Sum. Controvers.* Page 703. *Unde particularem Hominum Electionem statuentes, & particularem quoque Redemptionem (sunt enim illa omnia Paris ubique Latitudinis & Extensionis) docere debuerant, non universalem.* Wherefore, from the *Marrow's* teaching particular Election, it will not follow that he doth not also teach an universal *Redemption*. How these are consistent, is not the present Question.

Thus you see, that what the *Principal* chargeth upon the *Marrow*, is no singular Doctrine. And perhaps the Author of the *Explication of Passages* can inform you, that he has seen a *Misfire* from a *R. B.* who, tho' he own particular Election

lection, and that the Application of the purchased Redemption depends only upon the Spirit of God: Yet he therein owneth, *That Christ's Obedience to the Death, which formally and intentionally was for the Elect only, is materially and intentione operis, sufficient for the whole, as fully answering all the Demands of the Threatning, and Commands of the Precept of the Covenant of Works, and consequently as fully satisfying to the Justice, Holiness, and Righteousness of the Law-giver. That Christ in his Obedience to the Death, intentione operantis, and formally and primarily stood in the Room of the Elect only; but intentione operis, materially and consequently, may be said to stand in the Room of the whole. That what Christ did for the Elect, is intrinsically and materially sufficient for the whole as answering all the Demands of the Law and Justice, according to the Tenor of the Covenant of Works. Further he owns, that Christ is the Head of Eminence, Impetration, Influence, and Government to the whole visible Church: And that if any will prove a further Extension, he shall not contest it.*

These Expressions seem industriously clouded, and when their Author shall see meet to speak his Mind plainly, I apprehend he will not disown an universal Redemption. And without this I cannot comprehend how Christ can be said to have stood in the Room, not of the Elect only, but of the whole Race of *Adam*, as answering all the Demands of the Law and Justice, according to the Covenant of Works. I shall

not

46 *Review of a Conference betwixt*

not say, he is any of your Friends; for, (*Confer. Page 31.*) You say, You know not any of them to be of that Mind: And that some suspected, have disclaimed it in your hearing. Yet I think the Author of that *Missive* may be justly suspected of holding *universal Redemption*. For when he asserts that Christ hath answered all the Demands of the Law, and Justice, according to the Covenant of Works, in the Place and Room, not of the Elect only, but of the whole Race of *Adam*: How can the Law condemn any of them? What can Justice demand more of them? Are they not all redeemed from the Curse of the Law? And is not this an *universal Redemption*? It is therefore most charitable to judge, that the Author of that *Missive*, is none of your suspected Friends, who disclaimed *universal Redemption* in your hearing: For otherwise you may find, it difficult, to reconcile his Conduct with the Candor, one might expect from a Man of his Character.

For a second Answer to this Charge, you say, *Page 15, 16. 2dly.* No Universality of Redemption can be justly inferred from what the Marrow citeth out of Dr. Preston. The Principal adduced several Reasons from the Text and Context of the Marrow for justifying this Charge: You touch none of them in particular, but answer them all by denying the Conclusion. You add, " No further Extent of Christ's Death is taught there, than just so much as it necessary for laying a Foundation for believing." But what

what was that just Extent in the Opinion of Dr. Preston and the Marrow? For if they thought, that an universal Extent of Christ's Death was necessary to found the general Offer of him in the Gospel, then the *Principal's* Inference is just: Which you have not hitherto overturned. Well, how prove you that Dr. Preston and the Marrow, did not in this Passage insinuate any *universal Redemption*? For clearing this you add, "The Gospel Minister comforteth *Neophytus* the doubting Believer, by his Gloss upon *Mark* xvi. 15. viz. "Go and tell every Man, without Exception, and consequently the poor doubting Christian, whatsoever his Sins be, tell him these good Tidings, if he will come he shall be accepted, his Sins shall be forgiven him, &c. If he will take him, and accept of his Righteousness, he shall have him? Will the *Principal* or any Man of Conscience, deny this Connection?" Where I observe, 1. That you artfully bring in *this Connection*; which is not controverted, that you may divert your Reader from the main Point, which the *Marrow* lays as the Foundation of this Connection, and which you in representing his Gloss on *Mark* xvi. 15. conceal and omit, viz. *Go and tell every Man without Exception, here is good News for him, Christ is dead for him.* It was upon this that the *Principal* put the Question. *How can Ministers of the Gospel, tell every Man, as the Truth of God, that Christ is dead for him, without the Supposition*

Supposition of an universal Redemption? But to this you answer nothing. I observe, 2. That according to your Explication, such an Extent, of Christ's Death is here taught in the *Marrow*, as is necessary to lay a Foundation for believing: Then *Evangelista* is here exhorting *Neophytus* to believe, or to take and receive Christ. Yet in your Explication of the preceeding Passage, you said he was not exhorting him to believe, but to seek Assurance. And is not this Preposterous, to bring in a Gospel Minister exhorting an awakened Sinner to seek Assurance, before he exhort him to believe on Jesus Christ? I observe, 3. That according to your Explications of these two Passages, *Marrow*, Page 119, and Page 120. *Believing*, in *Acts* xvi. 31. hath a different Sense from *Believing* in *Mark* xvi. 15. In the former it is the seeking of Assurance, and in the latter, it is the receiving of Christ, unto which the Promise of eternal Life is annexed, and which Sinners are called unto in the Gospel Offer.

Your following Words are also remarkable, "viz. " I should never have had the Confidence once to open my Lips for offering Christ in the Gospel, did I not believe so much of the Sufficiency or Extent of his Death, call it what you will, (I contend with no Man about Words,) as shall afford me Warrant to say to the wickedest of Sinners, If ye believe, you shall be saved." Here I must observe to you. 1. That you seem to confound the

the

the *Sufficiency* and *Extent* of Christ's Death, under the specious Pretext of not contending about Words; tho' Orthodox Divines in their Disputes against *Arminians*, do carefully distinguish the one from the other. You seem also very indifferent in the Matter; as if the Doctrine of *particular Redemption* were not a Truth to be contended for, but smoothly to be turned into a meer *Logomachy*: Or that all dispute about it should be waved and given up; for *Page 17*, you say, *I dispute not about Universality or Particularity in the Matter*. If so much had been said by another, of the Doctrine of Redemption; it would perhaps have been detected and exposed as a *Pelagian Gangrene*. Again, 2. You frequently mention the Extent of Christ's Death *such, and just so much*, as is necessary to found the general Offer. But what that just and necessary Extent is, either in your own Opinion or that of the *Marrow*, ye forbear to tell us. May it then be asked, what that just Extent is, which you judge necessary unto your preaching the Gospel? Is it larger than the Elect World? Is the Death of Christ to be extended to all in the visible Church? Or to all unto whom the Gospel may come? Or to the whole Race of fallen *Adam*? Do you think, you have no Warrant to say to your Hearers, *If ye believe, ye shall be saved*? Unless you believe that Christ died for every one of them? And that you can, in the Name of God, tell every Man without Exception,

D

that

50 *Review of a Conference betwixt*

that here is good News for him, Christ is dead for him. This is the Opinion of the *Marrow*, and if you be of the same Mind; and that Christ's dying for every Man without Exception, is necessary unto the general Offer of the Gospel: Then you must either teach for divine Truth, what really is not so, or if you own it to be true, ye are as justly suspected of holding an universal Redemption, as any of your Friends, who disclaimed it in your hearing.

What follows about the *Deed of Gift*, needs very much your further Explanation. The *Marrow* saith, that God of his free Love to Mankind lost, hath made a Deed of Gift, and Grant unto them all. You tell us, that, *no more can be understood, than so much as layeth a Ground-work for these Offers of Christ in the Gospel; and that no other Deed of Gift is understood, save that which is necessary to support the eternal Truth, viz. Whosoever believeth in Christ shall not perish, but have everlasting Life.* Here I can conceive a Grant made unto all that hear the Gospel; but it is Conditional, asserting the Connection betwixt Faith as the Mean and Salvation as the End; and promising Life to him that believeth; but he that never believeth hath hereby no Right or Claim to Salvation, because he is not within the Terms of the Promise. In this Sense the *Principal* asserted, that the conditional Promise, is made to Believers only, exclusively of others; as is plain

plain from the Scope and Tenor of his Discourse. *Vid. Sermon Page 10, 11.* This is what Dr. Preston (of Faith Page 34.) calleth the Conditional Covenant of Grace, which is common to all: And what you call the general Offer of Christ in the Gospel. But beside this conditional Grant, you tell us of another Deed of Gift, which is antecedent hereto, and layeth the Ground-Work, and is the very Foundation of the the Offers of Christ in the Gospel. Now concerning this I desire to know, whether it be also Conditional, and if so, what that Condition is, as distinct from that contained in the eternal Truth, viz. *He that believeth, shall be saved?* Or if this Deed of Gift be absolute, making over Christ and all his purchased Benefits in an absolute Promise? And if it be an absolute Gift, conveyed by an absolute Promise, I want to be further informed, whether you hold this absolute Promise to be made to the Elect only, or to all that hear the Gospel? If it be made to the Elect only, then it conveys a Right to none else, but the Elect; neither can they lay Claim to it as belonging to them, while they are in an unregenerate State. And if this be your Mind you agree with the Principal, who saith of the absolute Promise, *Sermon Page 10. That it is declarative of the eternal Purpose of God: And tho' it be sometimes proposed Indefinitely, yet it is to be understood as made unto God's Elect.* And ye agree also with Dr. Preston, (Page above, who calleth it the absolute Co-

venant of Grace, which is particular only to the Elect, and is expressed *Jer. xxxi.* and *Ezek. xxxvi. 26.* But then where is your Warrant to tell every Man, without Exception, that Christ is dead for him, and is his? if you hold that the absolute Promise is made and *indorsed* unto all the Hearers of the Gospel, and that it conveys unto every one of them, a Right and Claim to Christ and all his purchased Benefits: Then why are not all and every one of them, made Partakers of these Benefits, whereunto they have such sure Right by God's absolute Promise? God's absolute Promise is a Declaration of his immutable Purpose, of what he will do; wherein God taketh upon himself the performing of the Thing promised; and wherein his Veracity and Faithfulness stand engaged for the accomplishing of it. Now, if the absolute Promise be made to all the Hearers of the Gospel; then God stands engaged to fulfill in every one of them the Work of Faith with Power, and to give to every one of them the new Heart and the new Spirit. Yet we find, it is not so; for all have not Faith. Therefore the absolute Gift and Promise is not made to all that hear the Gospel.

S E C T. IV.

Of the Charge against Mr. Marshal, and the Author of the Explication of Passages.

THUS I have travelled through your *Inquiry* as to what respects the *Marrow*: I hope the Journey shall be shorter in what remains.

As to the Assertion advanced by Mr. *Marshal*, and quarrelled by the *Principal*, you give it fairly up, *Confer*, Page 19. declaring that you cannot approve it, that the Words appear to you harsh and dangerous, and that you will have no Debate with the *Principal* on that Head. But as if this had been a Concession too rash, and large, you presently retract it again, and give your Gloss on *Marshal's* Words, thus, *That the Gift of Christ and Salvation in the Gospel Offers becometh a Gift beneficial to us, only upon our Acceptance. Then may the Believer comfortably assert, that this is a Truth, viz. God freely giveth Christ and Salvation to me particularly.* That the Reader may judge how just and agreeable this Gloss is, I shall in Opposition thereto repeat what is quarrelled in *Marshal*; *That the Thing we are*
bound

§4 A Review of a Conference betwixt

bound by the command of God to believe (*viz.* That God freely giveth Christ and Salvation to us particularly,) *is not a Truth before we believe it.* The Subject of *Marshal's* Proposition or Thing spoken of, is *God's Gift of Christ and Salvation to me in particular.* Of this he says, *it is not a Truth before it be believed.* In your Gloss, the Subject is *the general Gift of Christ and Salvation in the Gospel Offers.* Of this you say, *it is not beneficial to us before we accept of it.* But I hope you'll allow it to be a Truth before we believe it. In your Gloss, you make, *God's Gift of Christ and Salvation to me in particular,* to be a Conclusion which the Believer inferreth from his having accepted the Gospel-Offer: Whereas *Marshal* speaks of *this Gift to me in particular,* as the Object of the direct Act of Faith, which we are bound to believe by the Command of God. And when in two Propositions, neither the Things spoken of, nor what is said of them, are the same, I cannot see how you can make them equipolent: But after all your Labour, you profess *Page 21.* that you cannot go into the *Phraseologie*; nor I, to the falsehood expressed by it. You are perswaded that *Marshal* was far from any Design prejudicial to the Veracity and Faithfulness of the God of Truth. Neither did the *Principal* charge him with it; tho' he exposed the falsehood of the Assertion by an Argument *ab absurdo.*

You find, (*Confer. Page 22.*) that the *Principal* assaults at once *Mr. Marshal* and the Author

Author of the *Explication of Passages*. This is bold, indeed, who can bear it? It would make the Blood of any Man to boil, that is acquainted with that eminent Author of the *Explication of Passages*. And no doubt, Sir, you are sensibly touched; what say you to it? *The Principal shoots quite beside the Mark, and mistakes both Mr. Marshal and the Author of the Explication of Passages, as well, and yet more manifestly, than he did the Marrow.* Was there ever, since the Creation of Man upon the Earth, such a dull, blundering Block-head of a *Principal*, that cannot understand what he reads in his native Language, but at every turn, stumbles into unaccountable Mistakes? And tho' I be a little weary of this Work; yet it may be somewhat diverting, to trace the *Principal's* Mistakes in this Matter. And I shall turn to your Side, that you may shelter me from the Lashes of your *dramatick* Gentlemen.

The Author of the *Explication of Passages*, Page 14. proposeth an Exception against the *Marrow*, viz. that therein Faith is defined in Terms which import Assurance of a Mans particular Interest in Christ and eternal Salvation purchased by him. In answer to this Exception, that learned Author represents; That our Reformers generally defined Faith by Assurance; and that Mr. Marshal upon Sanctification, demonstrates very clearly and fully that somewhat of Assurance, more or less, is an essential Ingredient thereof. The *Principal* hereupon. (*Sermon Page 24.*)
said

said, that here was a plain Approbation of Mr. *Marshall* in that Opinion. But here he stumbled into two Mistakes, 1. That he thought the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, did in these Words ascribe to Mr. *Marshall* the Opinion of this Assurance being essential to Faith; because he held it to be an essential Ingredient thereof. 2. That he thought the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, did approve of this Opinion; because he says Mr. *Marshall* had clearly and fully demonstrated it. As if a Man must always necessarily approve that to be true, which he judgeth to be clearly and fully demonstrated by another. But you have clearly demonstrated the *Principal's* Mistake in both, and that the Author of the *Explication of Passages* neither ascribes that Opinion to Mr. *Marshall* nor approves of it himself. And this you make appear upon Inspection: For the *Principal* in the Account he is pleased to give of this Matter, from the *Explication of Passages*, omits these Words (*more or less*) which contain the main, and even the Strength of the Expression. The *Principal* thought that, when somewhat of Assurance, whether more or less, was said to be an essential Ingredient of Faith, there was still somewhat of Assurance said to be an essential Ingredient of Faith: But herein he was grossly mistaken. He, simple Man, thought that the *more or less* did not alter the Matter, while somewhat of the Assurance of God's giving Christ and Salvation to us particularly, was asserted

serted to be an essential Ingredient of saving Faith. He has had in View, perhaps, the old Scholastick Jargon, That *maius aut minus non variat speciem*, but was quite mistaken in this Case; for here (as you tell us) the Words, *more or less*, make up the *main, and even the Strength of the Expression*. He might be led into this Mistake, by observing that Mr. Marshal himself omits these Words, *more or less*, when he expresseth his Mind in this Matter. Gospel Mystery, Direction X. *We must get some Assurance of our Salvation in that very Faith whereby Christ himself is received.* And in his Words quoted by your self (Confer. Page 23.) *There must be somewhat of Assurance of our Salvation in saving Faith.* And frequently elsewhere, saying sometimes, that in saving Faith there is *some Assurance*, as Page 186, 187, 190. Edition Anno 1692. And at other Times, that in Faith there is *some true Assurance*, as Page 177, 183, 190. without once adding the Words, *more or less*. Hence the *Principal* might imagine that the adding, or omitting of these Words, could make no great Difference, either more or less in Mr. Marshal's Meaning. But he was greatly mistaken, in not adverting that, so soon as they were added by the worthy Author of the *Explication of Passages*, his eminent Authority made them presently become the *main, and even the very Strength of the Expression*. And the *Principal* omitting them, gave a quite other Turn to the Sense of it. I shall not say that this worthy Author

thor borrowed these Words from Mr. Saltmarsh, a famous *Antinomian*: But he thus defines Faith (*free Grace*, Page 78. Edit. 10th) Faith is truly and simply this: A being perswaded more or less of Christ's Love.

The *Principal* runs into a further Mistake, for he thought these Authors had all this while been speaking of the Believer's Interest in Christ as the Object of that Assurance or Perswasion, which they affirmed to be an essential Ingredient of Faith. But you acquaint, (*Confer.* Page 24.) "That neither Mr. Marshal nor the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, had the Eye mainly upon the Believer's Interest in Christ, when they asserted, that somewhat of Assurance more or less, is essential to Faith." The *Principal* thought that the Words of the *Marrow*, which the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, Page 14. undertook to vindicate, had imported an Assurance of an Interest in Christ, and Salvation by him; when it is said, *Be verily perswaded in your Heart, that Jesus Christ is yours, and that you shall have Life and Salvation by him, and that whatsoever Christ did for the Redemption of Mankind, he did it for you.* When Mr. Marshal saith, *Direction X.* We must "get some Assurance of our Salvation in that very Faith whereby Christ himself is received into our Hearts. We must endeavour to believe on Christ confidently, perswading and assuring our selves, in the Act of believing, that God freely giveth to us an Interest in

" Christ

Christ and his Salvation, according to his gracious Promise. The *Principal* fancied that Mr. *Marshall* is here speaking of our Interest in Christ, and his Salvation; that he made this our Interest in Christ the Object of our Persuasion and Assurance, and that he placed this Assurance in the direct Act of Faith. When Mr. *Marshall* saith, Page 169, That his Doctrine was owned by the chief Protestants, who commonly taught, *That Faith was a Persuasion or Confidence of our own Salvation by Christ.* And Page 177. *That we are to assure our selves in our Faith, That God freely giveth Christ and his Salvation to us particularly.* And when, Page 178, he undertakes to prove, *That there is, and must necessarily be, such an Assurance or Persuasion of our Salvation in saving Faith it self.* The *Principal* perswaded himself that Mr. *Marshall* was of Opinion, That Faith was a Persuasion of our own Salvation; that God's giving Christ and his Salvation to us particularly was the Object of this Persuasion; and that this Persuasion of our own Salvation by Christ was essential to Faith. But in all these he has quite mistaken the Sense of the Author; for *Confer.* Page 24. you tell him, "That the worthy Mr. *Marshall's* Meaning, and the Sense of the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, pointed especially towards the more direct Acts, and the chief Object of Faith, viz. *That Jesus Christ is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God through him.* This is the Assurance principally

“ pally meant (not the Perswasion of a particular Interest in Christ, and Salvation through him, but “ an Assurance of Christ’s Sufficiency “ to save.” And (as you judicially observe “ assuredly somewhat of it, more or less (to “ speak much within Bounds) belongs essentially to Faith.

This I have traced the *Principal’s* Mistakes, and, had not you kindly condescended to undeceive him, he might, for what I know, have still continued in them, so senseless and stupid is he. But whatever he think in the Matter, now, that you have so clearly and fully demonstrated the plain and genuine Sense and Meaning of these Authors, every Man of Sense must yield, and say, with your *Epaphras*, *I am convinced the Principal hath mistaken, and greatly injured the Marrow, Mr. Marshal, our Reformers, and the Author of the Explication of Passages.*

Surely, Sir, after such a plain Demonstration, no Man will be so impudent as to alledge, that you have sensed Mr. *Marshal* out of his true Sense and Meaning. And the Ages to come will admire the vast Capacity of your bright and accurate *Genius*, on Account of the notable Discoveries you have made in this Matter. For you have found (*Confer.* Page 25.) that Mr. *Marshal* makes a Distinction betwixt *Assurance* in the reflex Act which is not of the Essence of that Faith whereby we are justified, and the *Assurance* which he placeth in the direct Act, and holds to be of the Essence of saving Faith. Mr. *Mar-*

bal indeed seems to hold, that the Believer's Interest in Christ is the Object of this Perswasion or Assurance, which he placeth in the direct Act. Gospel Myst. Page 168. He calleth it, *An Assurance of our Salvation, and a perswading our selves in the Act of believing, that God freely giveth to us an Interest in Christ and his Salvation.* And Page 177. he says, *We are to assure our selves in our Faith, that God freely giveth Christ and his Salvation to us particularly.* And of the Object of this Assurance, he says, *We have no absolute Promise or Declaration in Scripture, That God certainly will or doth give Christ and his Salvation to any one of us in particular.* And Page 178, the Position he undertakes to prove, *That there is and must necessarily be such an Assurance or Perswasion of our Salvation in saving Faith it self.* And Page 182, he calleth it, *the Sinners averring confidently their personal Interest in God.* And Page 190, he concludes, *That we must necessarily have some Assurance of our Salvation in the direct Act of Faith, whereby we are justified, sanctified and saved, before we can upon any good Ground assure our selves that we are already in a State of Salvation, by that which they call the reflex Act.* And Page 191. he blames those who please and content themselves, without any Assurance of their Interest in Christ. And Page 192. he says, *That true Believers have some Assurance of Salvation in saving Faith it self.* And in several other Places, he speaks to the same Purpose, as if he held, That

the Believer's Interest in Christ is the Object of that Assurance, which he placeth in the direct Act of saving Faith. But however express his Words be, you have discovered (*Confer. Page 27.*) That it is not Mr. Marshal's Sentiment That the Essence of justifying Faith consisteth in the Believer's Assurance of his Interest in Christ. That on the Contrary he disowns this, and placeth the Assurance he holds to be essential to Faith, chiefly in that which pertains to the Object, and to its direct Acts, viz. In an Assurance of Christ's Sufficiency and Willingness to save undone Sinners, answerably unto Heb. vii. 25. He is able to save to the uttermost them that come unto God through him. Yea, here you have made a Discovery, which it seems Mr. Marshal himself had not learned; for he thought that the Object of that Assurance, which he placed in the direct Act of Faith, was not revealed by any absolute Promise or Declaration in Scripture; but you have found it in Heb. vii. 25, even Christ's Ability to save.

You inform us, That the Author of the *Explication of Passages*, reckons it his Honour to be ranked amongst these great Men, tho' as a Sharer of the Iniquity cast upon them. O wonderful Humility, to be even content with this Honour, tho' attended with Reproach. You conclude this Part with a Declaration, that you might detect the Principal's Mistakes by many other Instances, but that these may suffice, and you weary to transcribe

scribe : And so do I ; and thus we leave the
Principal's Mistakes.



S E C T. V.

Of the Foundation of the Gospel Offers.

YOU proceed to consider the Foundation
of the Gospel Offers, Confer. Page 30.
and you propose the Question distinctly ;
whether Dr. Preston's Gloss on Mark xvi. 15.
Preach the Gospel to every Creature, viz. Go
and tell every Man without Exception, that
there is good News for him, Christ is dead for
him, and if he will take him, and accept his
Righteousness, he shall have him) be a just
Exposition of that Command? By this your
Reader may be put in Expectation of a positive
and plain Answer. But you tell, *The Depth is*
great, and that you shall not launch far into it.
Assuredly, Sir, you have kept your Word. For
having sailed with many Trips, Turnings, and
Windings through nine several Pages, you re-
cover the Harbour from whence you launched
forth, without answering the Question proposed.
Only Page 39. you conclude, *That so much of*
the Extent of Christ's Death must needs be acknow-
ledged, as leaves no Room to one or other ; yea,
to the very worst of Sinners, for framing any valid
Objection against the Invitation given him to believe,

or to come to Christ. And this is no more than what you said, before your launching forth. *Confer.* Page 15. in Favours of the *Marrow*; viz. *No further Extent of Christ's Death is taught there, than JUST SO MUCH as is necessary to lay a Foundation for believing.* But the Question recurrcth again, What is that just Measure of the Extent of Christ's Death? And doth the Command, *Mark xvi. 15. Preach the Gospel to every Creature,* give Warrant to tell every Man, without Exception, here is good News for him, Christ is dead for him? But 'tis Pity, Sir, you did not dive further into this Depth. A Man of your Penetration, and so dexterous at Explications, might have found out some Expedient to clear all Difficulties. Your sage Judgment might have been of great Weight, with some of them you call your Friends, who perhaps on Account of their Expressions on this Subject, have been suspected of holding universal Redemption.

Some think they cannot preach the Gospel, unless they can warrantably tell every one of their Hearers, without Exception, that Christ is dead for him. They consider the Salvation offered in the Gospel, as a purchased Salvation. And that it cannot be offered unto every one of the Hearers of the Gospel, unless it be purchased for them, and consequently that Christ died for every one of them. Again, they conceive Salvation to be an absolute free Gift of God: And that they cannot warrantably call every

every one of their Hearers to accept of this Gift, unless they can tell them that it is given unto them, and consequently purchased for them. Again, they conceive Christ standing in the Covenant of Redemption as the Head of every Man, but, especially of the Elect; And that he is the Head of Eminence, Impetration, Influence and Government, at least unto the whole visible Church. Now his Impetration being by his doing and dying in their Stead; therefore as the Head of Impetration, he also died for all. Further, they consider the Covenant of Grace, as a Bundle of absolute Promises, and that in the Proposal of it in the Gospel, no Terms whatsoever are required of the Hearers. They think they cannot preach the Gospel, unless they can tell all their Hearers, that these absolute Promises are made unto them, and to every one of them in particular. Now all the Grace, contained in these absolute Promises, is purchased by Christ dying for them, and therefore he died for all that hear the Gospel. Moreover, they conceive, that by this Purchase and absolute Promise, made to all the Hearers of the Gospel, there is conveyed to every one of them a Right and Title unto the Grace, and Benefits of the Covenant. And therefore they think they may safely tell all their Hearers, regenerate and unregenerate, Elect or Reprobate, that this Right and Title belongs to them; and that Christ who purchased the same, hath died

for them all. *Finally*, They conceive that the principal Act of saving Faith consists in the Sinners taking Possession of Christ and his purchased, promised and freely-gifted Benefits. And they think they cannot call Sinners to believe or possess, unless they suppose them to have a Right to possess, prior to their believing. And seeing every one to whom the Gospel is preached, hath this Right, they think they have Warrant from the Command of Christ, *Mark xvi. 15. Go preach the Gospel to every Creature*: To tell every one without Exception, you have Right to Christ and his Salvation; Jesus Christ is yours, and whatever he did for the Redemption of Mankind, he did it for you, he is dead for you.

Sir, if you, (who own (*Confer. Page 33.*) *That the Lord Jesus in the eternal Council, in his Obedience, Sufferings, and upon the Cross, represented his Elect Seed, and them only.*) shall be pleased to clear your Friends in these Things, or to rectify their Mistakes, you'll do them a good and friendly Office.

Concerning the Scheme, subjoined to the *Principal's* Sermon, *You think*, (*Confer. Page last*) *for as much as he hath so openly lodged it with Patrons, he ought to name them.* Sir, you are perfectly in the Right, and I think you ought to push him to it, and that the Authority

Epaphroditus and Epaphras. 67

rity of the Judicatories of the Church should be interposed to oblige him to name those *Patrons* with whom he hath so openly lodged that Scheme: That so the Matter may be brought to a fair Trial, and the Innocent may be vindicated.

I am, &c.



26 SE 60

253 100 I